

pointed the plaintiff's manager in 1900 and had authority to sign and endorse cheques for the plaintiff. In 1905 Abbott opened a private bank account with the defendants, without the plaintiff's knowledge, and from 1907 to 1911 paid into that account 50 cheques of the plaintiff which he had drawn, or indorsed when necessary, "per pro." These cheques had all been collected in the usual way and credited to Abbott. About the beginning of 1912 Abbott's fraud was discovered and the action was brought to recover the amount of the cheques so improperly used by Abbott. It was contended for the plaintiff's that the cheques being signed "per pro" the Bank had notice under the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, s. 25 (R.S.C. c. 119, s. 51), and that the principal was only bound when Abbott was acting within the limits of his authority; and that at all events the cheques were forgeries. But the defendants claimed the protection of s. 82 of the Act, (R.S.C. c. 119, s. 173) the cheques having been crossed to the defendants, and that s. 25 did not apply after a bill had been paid. The Court of Appeal (Lord Reading, C.J., and Buckley and Phillimore, L.J.J.) upheld the defendant's contention and dismissed the action overruling the decision of Coleridge, J., who had given judgment for the plaintiffs. The Court of Appeal thought that the defendants were entitled to assume, after the first year or two, that Abbott was acting within his authority no objection having been made, and that as regards the cheques previously paid there had been a ratification by the plaintiff or his agents of the act of Abbott.

PATENT AGENT—DESCRIPTION OF UNREGISTERED PERSON—
"PATENT AGENCY."

Hans v. Graham (1914) 3 K.B. 400. This was a case stated by a magistrate. The defendant was summoned for describing himself as a "Patent Agent," contrary to the provisions of a statute forbidding any person to describe himself as a patent agent unless duly registered as such. It appeared that the defendant was not a registered patent agent, but that he occupied premises on which were affixed the words "Patent Agency." The defendant was convicted; but the Divisional Court (Ridley, Rowlatt, and Shearman, J.J.) held that the defendant had not described himself as a patent agent and quashed the conviction.

BUILDING SOCIETY—BORROWING—BANKING BUSINESS—ULTRA
VIRES—WINDING-UP—DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS—PRIORITIES
—SHAREHOLDERS—CREDITORS—MONEY HAD AND RECEIVED.

Sinclair v. Brougham (1914) A.C. 398. This was an appeal